



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,667	09/19/2000	Sachin Lawande	99,813	8067

20306 7590 03/18/2004

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 S. WACKER DRIVE
32ND FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

VU, VIET DUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/664,667

Applicant(s)

LAWANDE ET AL.

Examiner

Viet Vu

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Applicant is required to update statuses of related copending applications, i.e., providing serial numbers, cited in page 1 of the specification.

It is also noted that there are two claims that were inadvertently labeled as "claim 7" in the specification. Pursuant rule 1.126, the originally filed claims 7-16 will be renumbered as claims 7-17 with the second instance of "claim 7" is now claim 8. As a result, there are now 17 claims pending. Applicant is required to use the correct claim numbers in the next correspondence.

Non-Art Rejections:

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following language lacks proper antecedent basis:

In claim 4, line 1, "the automatic update process".

Art Unit: 2154

In claim 8, line 1, "the remote server".

Art Rejections:

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-3 and 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodgen, U.S. pat. No. 6,453,329.

Per claim 1, Dodgen discloses a system and method for enabling efficient data transferring and sharing between two computer devices comprising:

a) a data store for storing data objects (representation for data) and predefined data structures, e.g., XML styles,

Art Unit: 2154

templates or scripts, having an template identifier and fields with tags (tokens) (see cols 5-8 and col 9, lines 30-35),

b) a first application, e.g., browser, configured to display information to the user, i.e., by populating the template with data, i.e., expanding the template or script (see col 10, lines 18-22),

c) a client/server process configured to retrieve from the data store a corresponding template using template tag, and retrieve data objects using the field tags (meaning tokens) (see col 15, line 66 - col 16, line 2).

It is noted that Dodgen's client device can be a desktop or portable palmtop computer with any conventional communication interface, e.g., USB, Ethernet, modem, etc.

Dodgen does not explicitly disclose detailed means or step for populating/expanding the template for displaying information to user. It is noted that such populating/expanding means/step would have been analogous to the expansion means at the remote computer configured to retrieve the template and object data from a data store (see col 15, line 66 - col 16, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize the template/data retrieval steps to be performed on the client device because it would have enabled populating/expanding the

Art Unit: 2154

template for the purpose of displaying information to the user or processing data on the client device (see col 10, lines 18-22).

Per claims 2-3 and 8, an official notice is taken that the use of more than one collaborative application on a client device, e.g., palmtop computer, is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to recognize that downloaded templates and objects, e.g., XML scripts and object data, would have been utilized and shared by any two applications on the client device just as they were used and shared by two applications on two computer devices.

Claims 9-17 are similar in scope as that of claims 1-3 and 8 and hence are also rejected for the same rationale set forth above.

Conclusion:

7. The references cited by the examiner on PTO-892 but not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Viet Vu whose telephone number is 703-305-9597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:00am to 4:00pm.

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached on (703) 305-8498.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600. The Group fax number is 703-872-9306.



VIET D. VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2154
3/15/04